

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19, 20 and 22 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20 and 22-25 are presented for examination.

Claims 4-5, 10-11, 13-15, 19-20 and 22-23 has been objected to because of various informalities. Claims 4-5, 10-11, 13-15, 19-20 and 22-23 have been amended to place the claims in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 1-2, 5, 10-11, 14, 19-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Long et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,958). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Long.

Long discloses a method of calling a stack checking function that includes a compiled function. A determination is made if additional memory is required for executing the complied function. If no additional memory is required, then the compiled function is called and executed. If additional memory is required, then additional memory is allocated. See Long at Abstract.

Claim 1 of the present application recites emulating a block of code on a second processor, and using a single instruction to monitor a resources of the second processor used during emulation to determine whether resource requirements of a first processor have been exceeded. Applicants submit that Long does not disclose such a feature. Long discloses determining if additional memory is required for executing a compiled function. However, nowhere does Long disclose emulating code, or determining if resource requirements are exceeded during emulation. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Long.

Claims 4, 6-9, 13, 15-18 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Long in view of Yellin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,740,441). Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over Long in view of Yellin.

Yellin discloses a program interpreter for computer programs written in a bytecode language, which uses a restricted set of data type specific bytecodes. See Yellin at Abstract. However, Yellin does not disclose or suggest emulating a block of code on a second processor, using a single instruction to monitor a resources of the second processor used during emulation to determine whether resource requirements of a first processor have been exceeded.


As discussed above, Long does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Since Long and Yellin do not disclose or suggest emulating a block of code on a second processor, using a single instruction to monitor a resources of the second processor used during emulation to determine whether resource requirements of a first processor have been exceeded, any combination of Long and Yellin would not disclose or suggest the feature. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over Long in view of Yellin.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF,  TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 22, 2006

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980